SANDLER, REIFF & YOUNG, P.C.

December 19, 2008

Via Factimile and First Class Mail

Frankie D. Hampton, Esq.
Office of the General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

Re: MUR 6132

Dear Ms. Hampton:

We are writing on behalf of our client, the Queen Anne's County (Maryland) Democratic Central Committee, respondent in the above-captioned MUR, in response to the Complaint filed in this matter. A Statement of Designation of Counsel is attached.

The Complaint alleges that the Queen Anne's County (Maryland) Democratic Central Committee (the "County Party") sponsored three newspaper advertisements "without the proper authority line." The reference to "authority line" is to the disclaimer requirements applicable under Maryland state law, see Annotated Code of Md. §13-401, the enforcement of which clearly falls outside the Commission's jurisdiction. Thus the Complaint itself does not state any violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 as amended, 2 U.S.C. §§431 et seq. (the "Act") or the Commission's regulations.

The County Party is not a federal political committee and accordingly is not registered with the Commission. We are advised that the total cost of the three advertisements was approximately \$3,000, and the County Party did not, during calendar year 2008, make any disbursements for exempt activities, within the meaning of 2 USC §431(4)(C). The question that arises is whether the County Party was a "political committee" within the meaning of the Act.

As a review of the advertisements (attached to the Complaint) will confirm, most of the content of each advertisement promotes the election of Democratic candidates generally, with the remainder of the content of each advertisement arguably expressly advocating the election of then-Sen. Barack Obama, the Democratic Party nominee for President. In these circumstances, it is likely that approximately only one-third to one-half the costs of the advertisements would count as "contributions" or "expenditures" under the Act. See Advisory Opinion 2006-11 (April 25, 2006). Thus, the County Party exceeded the \$1,000 threshold of section 431(4)(C) by only a

Frankie D. Hampton, Esq. December 19, 2008 Page Two

de minimus amount, if at all. For this reason, also, the Commission should find no reason to believe that the County Party violated the Act or the Commission's regulations.

If OGC decides to recommend proceeding with this case, we request that it be referred to the Commission's Alternative Dispute Resolution Program.

If the Commission has any questions or needs additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph E. Sandler

Attorneys for Respondent
Queen Anne's County Democratic

Central Committee

(410) 100-3031

2004/004 P.2 2008/013

KA4 BP:8/ BODY\ED\SI

PEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION 969 E Street, NW Washington, DC 20465

STAYBURNT OF BESIGNATION OF COUNSEL
Please use engines for good Represedent/Client

May 6/32
NAME OF COUNSEL! Jeseph & Soudlar Meil P. Kith
FIRM: Sauller Reiff & Young P. C
ADDRESS: 300 M St SE # 1100
Wach PC 70003
TELEPHONE- OFFICE (24) 477 /1/1
PAX(20) 4-79 1115
The above-named individual and/or tirm is hereby designated as my
coinsel and is authorized to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission and to set on my bulgat before the Commission.
12/17/08 Jany W. Kym Treasure Title
Payley Hayman
MERPONDENTYOLIENT QUEEN Anne's Comty Dem Cent Comp Hosso Frinty + Nancy Hagingin as Texase
MALINO P.O. SOX PI
Centraille, MD 21617
THE EPHONE HOME
WOMAN 4/0, 490 - 0307
derection is being counted as part of an investigation being conducted by the Pedicul Maction
translates and the contributedly provides of 1440 (307) by (1007) and the resent
CA7

904425087

M